



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/027,171	12/21/2001	John Gilbert	CVZ-002	9744

959 7590 06/07/2005

LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP.
28 STATE STREET
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER

GORDON, BRIAN R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1743

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/027,171	GILBERT ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brian R. Gordon	1743	

All Participants:

(1) Brian R. Gordon.

(2) Anthony A. Laurentano.

Status of Application: ____

(3) ____.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 3 June 2005

Time: ____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner left a message for Mr. Laurentano stating the after final amendment filed 5/19/2005 would be entered. However, the argument's pertaining to claims 99-102 and 105-108 were not found to be persuasive for the argument is directed to the process by which the device is made. The device as taught by Finch is structurally equivalent to that as claimed by applicant, irregardless of the process of manufacture. The examiner also stated the remaining claims may be allowed (pending SPE approval) if applicant agreed to cancel the remaining rejected claims.